arXiv:1204.2149v2 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 10 Nov 2012

On the strong influence of boundaries on the bulk microstructure of an interacting Bose gas

Max Tomchenko

Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics
14b, Metrolohichna Str., Kiev 03680, Ukraine
E-mail:mtomchenko@bitp.kiev.ua

It is usually assumed that the boundaries do not affect the bulk microstructure of an interacting Bose gas. Therefore, the models use the most convenient cyclic boundary conditions. We show that, in reality, the boundaries affect strongly the bulk microstructure, by changing the ground-state energy E_0 *and the energy of quasiparticles* $E(k)$*. For the latter, we obtain the formula* $E(k) \approx \sqrt{\left(\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m}\right)^2 + \frac{n\nu(k)}{2^f}\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{m}}$ *differing from the well-known Bogolyubov formula by the factor* $1/2^f$*, where* f *is the number of noncyclic coordinates. The influence of boundaries is related to the topology, namely to the difference of the sets of oscillatory eigenmodes for closed and open systems.*

Keywords Bose gas, Boundary conditions, Dispersion curve

1 Introduction

A weakly interacting Bose gas (WIBG) has been well studied till now (see, e.g., the review [1]). The foundations of the microscopic model of WIBG were developed about six decades ago in the classical works by N. Bogolyubov [2] and Bogolyubov and D. Zubarev [3]. Later, the formulas for WIBG were reproduced in numerous works on He II. About twenty years, WIBG is studied experimentally with the use of systems containing $\gtrsim 10^4$ atoms of alkaline metals in traps [4]. However, we will show that a surprises are possible in this field. In the present work, we study the influence of walls of a vessel on the bulk microstructure of WIBG.

It is commonly considered that the boundaries affect only a microstructure of the near-wall layer. Therefore, the convenient cyclic boundary conditions (BCs) are usually used in the modeling of bulk properties. But such conditions are realized seldom (and they are impossible for the three-dimensional systems, unless a gas occupies the whole Universe). However, though the boundaries are far from the majority of atoms in a vessel, their influence on these atoms can turn out significant. In fact, we know the "butterfly effect" in complicated nonlinear systems, where a small action can transit the system in a qualitatively different state. In work

[5], the role of boundaries was studied for a Bose fluid by means of the calculation of the wave functions (WFs) under zero BCs. It was proved that the boundaries *affect strongly* the ground-state energy of the system, E_0, and the dispersion curve $E(k)$. This result is of importance, and it contradicts the commonly accepted expectations. However, in the calculation [5] the WFs of the system were expanded in the sets of collective variables $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$, which are not independent. This is quite admissible, but may cause questions. Therefore, we will solve the problem within another method, where WFs are expanded in *independent* basis functions.

It was found in several works that the presence of boundaries does not affect the bulk microstructure. The main reason for the effect to be missed is the simplified modeling of interatomic interaction (e.g., the point interaction). This is discussed in [5, 6]. Possible experiments and the general discussion of the influence of boundaries are considered in [5]. Below, we consider a system with a nonpoint interaction.

2 Ground state of a Bose gas

The boundaries influence a microstructure of the system a) directly by means of the influence of the near-surface layer on the bulk properties and b) indirectly due to a difference of the collections of harmonics in the expansion of the interatomic potential for closed and open systems. It is clear intuitively that the first effect is slight, and the analysis in [5] confirmed this assumption. Therefore, we do not consider the factor in WFs that ensures vanishing of WFs on the boundaries. We will consider only the second circumstance, namely the difference of the collections of harmonics.

The key point is simple (see [5] for details). If $x_1, x_2 \in [-L_x/2, L_x/2]$, we have $x_1 - x_2 \in [-L_x/2, L_x/2]$ under cyclic BCs and $x_1 - x_2 \in [-L_x, L_x]$ under zero BCs. So, under cyclic BCs, the expansion of the interatomic potential takes the form

$$U(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|) = \frac{1}{V}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}^{(2\pi)} \nu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)}, \tag{1}$$

$$\nu(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \nu(k) = \int U(r) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{r}} d\mathbf{r}, \tag{2}$$

where 2π over the sum means that $\mathbf{k}$ runs the values

$$\mathbf{k} = 2\pi\left(\frac{j_x}{L_x}, \frac{j_y}{L_y}, \frac{j_z}{L_z}\right) \tag{3}$$

with integers j_x, j_y, j_z. But, under zero BCs, the expansion reads

$$U(|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|) = \frac{1}{2^f V}\sum_{\mathbf{k}}^{(\pi)} \nu(\mathbf{k}) e^{i\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)}, \tag{4}$$

where π over the sum indicates that $\mathbf{k}$ runs the values

$$\mathbf{k} = \pi\left(\frac{j_x}{L_x}, \frac{j_y}{L_y}, \frac{j_z}{L_z}\right). \tag{5}$$

Here, $f = 3$ is the space dimensionality, and $V = L_x L_y L_z$ is the volume of the system. Since the realistic potentials differ from zero significantly only at small $|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2|$, the values of $\nu(k)$ are identical for both BCs, though the integration volume over $\mathbf{r}$ in (2) is different by 2^f times. The difference of expansions (4) and (1) will cause an effect.

We note that the potential $U(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)$ can be expanded not only according to Eq. (4), but in different other complete sets of basis functions, e.g., in the functions $e^{i\mathbf{k}_1\mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2\mathbf{r}_2}$ with $\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2$ (3) and where $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ are considered as two independent radius-vectors, or in the sines $\sin k_x x \sin k_y y \sin k_z z$, etc. We can use any of these complete collections of functions: the expansion in each of the collections reproduces exactly the potential $U(\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)$ under the condition that the points $\mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{r}_2$ lie inside the system. In this case, under zero BCs, the expansion in the functions $e^{i\mathbf{k}_1\mathbf{r}_1 + i\mathbf{k}_2\mathbf{r}_2}$ is not reduced to (4) (where $\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2$ is treated as one radius-vector). We will use the expansion (4), for which the solution can be found by a most simple way.

Let us consider N interacting Bose particles, which are placed in a box $L_x \times L_y \times L_z$ with noncyclic boundaries. The Hamiltonian of the system reads

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\sum_j \triangle_j + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}^{i\neq j} U(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|). \tag{6}$$

We seek the ground-state WF in the standard form [7]

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_0 &= e^S, \quad S = S_1 + \sum_{j_1 j_2}' S_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2}) + \\ &+ \sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3}' S_3(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2}, \mathbf{r}_{j_2} - \mathbf{r}_{j_3}) + \sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}' S_4(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2}, \mathbf{r}_{j_2} - \mathbf{r}_{j_3}, \mathbf{r}_{j_3} - \mathbf{r}_{j_4}) + \ldots,\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the prime over the sums means that $j_l \neq j_k$ for each $\mathbf{r}_{j_l} - \mathbf{r}_{j_k}$. In (7), the last term is the sum with S_N describing the correlations between all particles. Performing the Fourier transformation of the functions S_j and extracting the lowest sums from the highest ones, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \tilde{S}_1 + \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1\neq 0}\frac{a_2(\mathbf{k}_1)}{2!}\sum_{j_1 j_2}' e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2})} + \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2\neq 0}^{\mathbf{k}_1\neq\mathbf{k}_2}\frac{a_3(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)}{3!}\sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3}' e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2}) + i\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_2} - \mathbf{r}_{j_3})} + \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_3\neq 0}\frac{a_4^r(\mathbf{k}_1,0,\mathbf{k}_3)}{4!}\sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}' e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2}) + i\mathbf{k}_3(\mathbf{r}_{j_3} - \mathbf{r}_{j_4})} + \\ &+ \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_3\neq 0}^{\mathbf{k}_2\neq\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_3}\frac{a_4(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_3)}{4!}\sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4}' e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1} - \mathbf{r}_{j_2}) + i\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_2} - \mathbf{r}_{j_3}) + i\mathbf{k}_3(\mathbf{r}_{j_3} - \mathbf{r}_{j_4})} + \ldots,\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $a_2(-\mathbf{k}) = a_2(\mathbf{k})$ and

$$a_3(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2) = a_3(-\mathbf{k}_2,-\mathbf{k}_1) = a_3(-\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2,\mathbf{k}_2) = a_3(\mathbf{k}_1, -\mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_1). \tag{9}$$

In the last term of (8) $\mathbf{k}_1 \neq \mathbf{k}_3$. We extract the sum with a_4^r, because the equations yield $a_4(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2 \to 0, \mathbf{k}_3) \neq a_4^r(\mathbf{k}_1, 0, \mathbf{k}_3)$. In expansion (8), the lowest sums cannot be extracted from the highest ones. Eq. (8) is the expansion of the logarithm of Ψ_0 in independent basis functions,

$$\begin{aligned}&1,\ e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})},\ e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})+i\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-\mathbf{r}_{j_3})},\\ &e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})+i\mathbf{k}_3(\mathbf{r}_{j_3}-\mathbf{r}_{j_4})},\ e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})+i\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-\mathbf{r}_{j_3})+i\mathbf{k}_3(\mathbf{r}_{j_3}-\mathbf{r}_{j_4})},\ldots\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

(here $\mathbf{k}_j \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{k}_2 \neq \mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_3$; moreover, $\mathbf{k}_1 \neq \mathbf{k}_3$ in $e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})+i\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-\mathbf{r}_{j_3})+i\mathbf{k}_3(\mathbf{r}_{j_3}-\mathbf{r}_{j_4})}$, see (8)). Their independence is related to the different numbers of vectors $\mathbf{r}_j$ or to the difference in j_l or in $\mathbf{k}_l$ (for the same $\mathbf{r}_j$). The independence holds under cyclic and zero BCs, since the exponential functions are the basis functions of a Fourier expansion. It is of importance that the wave vectors $\mathbf{k}_l$ enter (10) at the difference of coordinates. Therefore, $\mathbf{k}_l$ run values (5) and (3) under zero and cyclic BC, respectively. Since the functions contain the **k**- and **r**-variables, such an approach can be called the "*kr*-method". Similar approaches were used earlier: structure (7) was considered by Feenberg [7], Vakarchuk and Yukhnovskii [8], and Krotscheck [9]. However, expansion (8) (as well as (21) and (22) below) was not applied: either another representation was used [7]; or the terms with $j_k = j_l$ were introduced (8); or the transition to the collective variables $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$ was made [8]; or the study was carried out only in the **r**-representation [9]. We proceed from structure (8), (21), and (22), where the basis functions are independent for various BCs. Since the coefficients a_j in each sum in (8) are identical for different $\mathbf{r}_j$ and identical $\mathbf{k}_l$, we will collect the coefficients of sums

$$\sum_{j_1 j_2}^{\prime} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})},\ \sum_{j_1 j_2 j_3}^{\prime} e^{i\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})+i\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-\mathbf{r}_{j_3})},\ldots \tag{11}$$

(which are the collective variables), rather than of separate functions (10).

We now pass to the solution. For Ψ_0 (7) and Hamiltonian (6), the Schrödinger equation

$$\hat{H}\Psi_0 = NE_0\Psi_0 \tag{12}$$

is reduced to

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\sum_j[\triangle_j S + (\nabla_j S)^2] + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{ij}^{i\neq j} U(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) = NE_0. \tag{13}$$

Let us substitute (4) and (8) in the last equation. In view of the independence of functions (10), Eq. (13) holds, if the coefficients in front of sums (11) and of the constant are equal to zero. After calculations, we obtain the equations for the ground-state energy E_0 (per atom) and the functions a_j:

$$E_0 = \frac{n\nu(0)}{2^{f+1}} - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\neq 0}^{(\pi)}\frac{\hbar^2 k^2}{2m}a_2^2(\mathbf{k}) - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2\neq 0}^{(\pi)\mathbf{k}_1\neq\mathbf{k}_2}\frac{\hbar^2 k_1^2}{2m}a_3(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)a_3(-\mathbf{k}_1,-\mathbf{k}_2) + \ldots, \tag{14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n\nu(k)m}{2^f\hbar^2}+a_2(\mathbf{k})k^2-a_2^2(\mathbf{k})k^2=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\neq 0}^{(\pi)}a_2(\mathbf{q})\left\{(q^2+\mathbf{kq})a_2(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q})+\right.\\
+\quad &\left.(2q^2-\mathbf{kq})a_3(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q})+(q^2+\mathbf{kq})a_3(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q})+q^2a_3(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{q})\right\}+\ldots, \qquad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&a_3(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2)[\epsilon_0(\mathbf{k}_1)+\epsilon_0(\mathbf{k}_2)+\epsilon_0(\mathbf{k}_2-\mathbf{k}_1)]=2\mathbf{k}_1\mathbf{k}_2a_2(\mathbf{k}_1)a_2(\mathbf{k}_2)+\\
+\quad &2\mathbf{k}_2(\mathbf{k}_2-\mathbf{k}_1)a_2(\mathbf{k}_2)a_2(\mathbf{k}_2-\mathbf{k}_1)+2\mathbf{k}_1(\mathbf{k}_1-\mathbf{k}_2)a_2(\mathbf{k}_1)a_2(\mathbf{k}_1-\mathbf{k}_2)+\\
+\quad &\frac{6}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}_3\neq 0}^{(\pi)}(k_3^2+\mathbf{k}_3\mathbf{k}_2)a_2(\mathbf{k}_3)[a_3(\mathbf{k}_1,\mathbf{k}_2+\mathbf{k}_3)+a_3(\mathbf{k}_1+\mathbf{k}_3,\mathbf{k}_2+\mathbf{k}_3)]+\ldots, \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\epsilon_0(\mathbf{k})=\mathbf{k}^2(1-2a_2(\mathbf{k})), \qquad (17)$$

where the dots mean the higher corrections (the sums with a_4^2, a_5^2, ..., a_N^2 in (14) and the sums with a_3^2, $a_2a_4^r$, a_2a_4, etc. in (15) and (16)). We omit the equations for the functions $a_{j\geq 4}$.

For a weak interaction, the corrections with $a_{j\geq 3}$ can be neglected. With regard for (19), relations (14)-(17) yield

$$E_0=\frac{n\nu(0)}{2^{f+1}}-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\neq 0}^{(\pi)}\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m}a_2(\mathbf{k})-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{k}\neq 0}^{(\pi)}\frac{n\nu(k)}{2^{f+1}}, \qquad (18)$$

$$\frac{n\nu(k)m}{2^f\hbar^2}+a_2(\mathbf{k})k^2-a_2^2(\mathbf{k})k^2=0. \qquad (19)$$

The same formulas were obtained in [5] within a different method.

For cyclic BCs, is is necessary to use expansion (1). This leads to the replacements $\nu(k)/2^f\rightarrow\nu(k)$, $\sum^{(\pi)}\rightarrow\sum^{(2\pi)}$ in all equations, and formulas (18)–(19) become the well-known Bogolyubov formulas. Formula (14) for cyclic BCs without corrections with $a_{j\geq 3}$ was deduced earlier in [7].

3 Excited state with one quasiparticle

The WF of a state with one phonon is sought in the form [10, 3]

$$\Psi_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{r}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{r}_N)=\psi_{\mathbf{k}}\Psi_0, \qquad (20)$$

$$\psi_{\mathbf{k}}=\rho_{-\mathbf{k}}+\delta\psi_{\mathbf{k}}, \qquad (21)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}=\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum\limits_{j=1}^{N}e^{-i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{r}_j}$, and $\delta\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ corresponds to higher corrections. Their exact form is determined by the Schrödinger equation. We write them similarly to (8):

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta\psi_{\mathbf{k}}\quad=\quad&\sum_{\mathbf{q}_1\neq 0,-\mathbf{k}}^{(\pi)}b_2(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{k})\sum_{j_1j_2}{}^{\prime}e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1)\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-i\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{r}_{j_2}}+\\
&+\sum_{\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2\neq 0}^{(\pi)\,\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2+\mathbf{k}\neq 0}b_3(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{k})\sum_{j_1j_2j_3}{}^{\prime}e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-i\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-i\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{r}_{j_3}}+\ldots \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

Here,

$$b_2(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}) = b_2(-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}), \tag{23}$$

$$b_3(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{k}) = b_3(\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{k}) = b_3(-\mathbf{q}_1-\mathbf{q}_2-\mathbf{k},\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{k}) = b_3(\mathbf{q}_1,-\mathbf{q}_1-\mathbf{q}_2-\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}). \tag{24}$$

This relation differs from the solution in the $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$-representation [11, 5] by the absence of terms with $j_k = j_l$ in sums. Therefore, the higher sums cannot be reduced to the lower ones (it is possible in the $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$-representation, since the terms with $j_k = j_l$ have a structure of lower sums).

The Schrödinger equation yields the equation for $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\sum_j \{\triangle_j\psi_{\mathbf{k}} + 2(\nabla_j\psi_{\mathbf{k}})\times\nabla_j S\} = E(\mathbf{k})\psi_{\mathbf{k}}, \tag{25}$$

where $E(\mathbf{k})$ is the phonon energy. Let us substitute $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ (21), (22) in (25). Formulas (21) and (22) give the expansion of $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ in the independent (for a fixed $\mathbf{k}$) functions

$$e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{r}_j},\ e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1)\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-i\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{r}_{j_2}},\ e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-i\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-i\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{r}_{j_3}},\ldots \tag{26}$$

(their independence can be easily seen if we take into account that, for example, $e^{i(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-i\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{r}_{j_2}-i\mathbf{q}_2\mathbf{r}_{j_3}} = e^{i\mathbf{k}\mathbf{r}_{j_1}+i\mathbf{q}_1(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})+i\mathbf{q}_2(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_3})}$, and $e^{i\mathbf{q}(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})}$ are the basis functions of the expansion of a function of the form $f(\mathbf{r}_{j_1}-\mathbf{r}_{j_2})$ in the Fourier series). Equation (25) holds, if the coefficients in front of the functions (26) are zero. This yields the equations for $E(k)$ and b_j:

$$\begin{aligned}\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) &= \epsilon_0(-\mathbf{k}) - \frac{4}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\neq 0,-\mathbf{k}} b_2(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k})[q^2 a_2(\mathbf{q}) + (q^2+\mathbf{k}\mathbf{q})a_2(-\mathbf{q})] - \\ &- \frac{4}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\neq 0,-\mathbf{k}} q^2 b_2(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k})a_3(\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k}) - \frac{12}{N}\sum_{\mathbf{q}\neq 0} q^2 a_2(\mathbf{q})b_3(\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}) + \ldots,\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & b_2(\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k})[\epsilon_0(\mathbf{q}) + \epsilon_0(-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}) - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})] = -\mathbf{k}\mathbf{q}a_2(\mathbf{q}) + \mathbf{k}(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{k})a_2(-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}) + \\ + \ & k^2 a_3(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k})/2 + k^2 a_3(-\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k})/2 + \frac{2}{N}\times \\ \times \ & \sum_{\mathbf{q}_1\neq 0,-\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}} a_2(\mathbf{q}_1)\left\{(q_1^2+\mathbf{q}_1\mathbf{q})b_2(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q},\mathbf{k}) + (q_1^2-\mathbf{q}_1(\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{k}))b_2(\mathbf{q}_1-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k})\right\} + \ldots,\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & b_3(\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{k})[\epsilon_0(\mathbf{q}_1) + \epsilon_0(\mathbf{q}_2) + \epsilon_0(-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}_1-\mathbf{q}_2) - \epsilon(\mathbf{k})] \approx \\ \approx \ & -\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)a_3(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{q}_2) + k^2 a_4(\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}_1,\mathbf{k})/3 + \\ + \ & 2(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)b_2(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{k})[2\mathbf{q}_1 a_2(\mathbf{q}_1) + (\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2)a_3(\mathbf{q}_1+\mathbf{q}_2,\mathbf{q}_2)].\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Here, $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}) = 2mE(\mathbf{k})/\hbar^2$, and the dots mean the higher corrections (the sums with $a_{l\pm 1}b_l$ and $a_l b_l$ in (27) and the sums with $a_{l\pm 2}b_l$, $a_{l\pm 1}b_l$, and $a_l b_l$ in (28)). We omit the equations for $b_{j\geq 4}$ and write the equation for b_3 in the zero approximation (we do not symmetrize its right-hand side according to (24) to avoid too bulky formulas). We also neglect $1/N$ in coefficients of the form $1+1/N$ in Eqs. (14)-(17) and (27)–(29).

In the presence of walls, the stationary state is a standing wave, rather than a traveling one. The solution for a standing wave is a superposition of traveling waves (the normalizing factor is omitted),

$$\tilde{\psi}_{\mathbf{k}} = \psi_{\mathbf{k}} + 7\,\text{permutations}, \tag{30}$$

where the permutation means $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ with the different sign of one or several components of the vector $\mathbf{k}$. The energy of such a wave coincides with that of a traveling wave. If the interaction is switched-off, $\Psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ must be reduced to the solution for a free particle in box (in this case, it is necessary to consider the vanishing of the WF on boundaries [5]). For this solution, $\mathbf{k}$ takes values (5). Therefore, $\mathbf{k}$ of a phonon must take also the same values.

For a weak interaction, we can neglect the corrections with b_j. Then we have

$$E(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\hbar^2\epsilon_0(-\mathbf{k})}{2m} = \frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m}\left(1-2a_2(-\mathbf{k})\right). \tag{31}$$

Taking (19) into account, we obtain the Bogolyubov formula

$$E(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{2m}\right)^2 + \frac{n\nu(k)}{2^f}\frac{\hbar^2k^2}{m}}, \tag{32}$$

but with the additional factor 2^{-f} due to boundaries. This factor is absent under cyclic boundaries. In the general case, f is the number of noncyclic coordinates. Formula (32) was also obtained in [5] within the $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$-method.

Note that it is easy to see without any calculations that the transition from cyclic to zero BCs requires one to add the factor $1/2^f$ at $\nu(k)$ in the formulas for E_0 and $E(k)$: indeed, the potential enters the Schrödinger equation only as sum (4), in which the factor $1/2^f$ arises.

In the proposed kr-method, each of the equations in the chains of equations for Ψ_0 and $\psi_{\mathbf{k}}$ contains $\sim N^2$ terms (but only several terms in $\rho_{\mathbf{k}}$-method [11, 5]). It is impossible to solve such equations for a strong interaction. However, the kr-method is effective for a weak interaction. The advantage of the kr-method consists in the independence of the basis functions not only under cyclic BCs, but under zero BCs as well.

Since Ψ_0 is quantitatively different for zero and cyclic BCs, the amounts of a condensate must differ significantly for these BCs, especially for Bose systems with high density.

In [6], the problem with boundaries (1D, $f=1$) was solved within the Gross–Pitaevskii approach, and two solutions for the dispersion law were found: traditional Bogolyubov solution and the above-obtained one (32). Two solutions mean the existence of two ways to the diagonalization of a Hamiltonian, with two different ground states. But, in the approach with N-particle WFs, two ground states are forbidden by the theorem of nodes (the case with degeneration is improbable). One solution for the ground state was found above and in [5]; it corresponds to the dispersion law (32). Hence, the "ground state" for the traditional dispersion law [6] has nodes and is not the lowest state of the system. In this case, the traditional dispersion law must not be realized, if $f > 0$.

4 Conclusion

We have shown that the boundaries affect strongly the bulk microstructure of a Bose gas and a Bose fluid. This influence is not quite trivial and is related to the difference of the collections of oscillatory eigenmodes for closed and open systems. As far as we understand, the effect is due to the fact that a standing wave keeps the memory of walls, because it is modulated by them. But a particle loses the memory of a wall after several collisions with other particles. Therefore, this effect must be typical of all weakly excited systems, whose physics is determined by collective excitations (waves), rather than separate atoms. In particular, it must be inherent in quantum crystals, superconductors and some Fermi systems, for which the Bogolyubov dispersion law was obtained [12].

[1] A. Posazhennikova, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 1111 (2006).

[2] N.N. Bogoliubov, J. Phys. USSR **11**, 23 (1947).

[3] N.N. Bogoliubov and D.N. Zubarev, Sov. Phys. JETP **1**, 83 (1956).

[4] A.G. Leggett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 307 (2001).

[5] M.D. Tomchenko, submitted in Ukr. J. Phys., arXiv:cond-mat/1201.1845.

[6] M. Tomchenko, submitted in Phys. Rev. A, arXiv:cond-mat/1211.1723.

[7] E. Feenberg, Ann. Phys. **84**, 128 (1974).

[8] I.A. Vakarchuk and I.R. Yukhnovskii, Theor. Math. Phys. **40**, 626 (1979).

[9] E. Krotscheck, G.-X. Qian, and W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 4245 (1985).

[10] R. Feynman, Phys. Rev. **94**, 262 (1954).

[11] I.A. Vakarchuk and I.R. Yukhnovskii, Theor. Math. Phys. **42**, 73 (1980).

[12] S. Tomonaga, Progr. Theor. Phys. **5**, 544 (1950).

.